

RAMONA VILLAGE DESIGN COMMITTEE

Appendix to Final Initial Project Study Report Vote Information

Below is a listing of the Ramona Village Design Committee (RVDC) passing votes that were not unanimously supported. The full minutes of all RVDC meetings may be found on the County of San Diego website at:

<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/cnty/cntydepts/landuse/planning/GP2020/pubs/ramonatc/phase3.htm>

5.04.05 Motion by Roberson: The group to reserve further discussion of pocket parks. Motion passed with Kesinger abstaining.

5.04.05 Motion by DeMund: Urges the County to find a way to make Ramona's Town Hall usable. 2nd Salvatore. Motion Passed with 8 yes and 1 (Roberson) abstaining.

5.04.05 Motion: We designate the design Review Board to develop design standards for the Ramona Town Center with the understanding that this group will review and approve. Motion Passed 8-0-1 with Hagey abstaining.

5.18.05 Motion by Lewallen: This group support the concept of no median in Village Center with expanded parkway in Village Center. Encourage medians in the Gateway and Paseo areas and implement the mini bypass from 3rd to 10th streets with B Street going west and D Street going east one way. Salvatore 2nd 8 yes and 1 no (Kiehne-Lamkin)

6.01.05 Motion by Roberson: Create a base that is at 7.3 and build in incentives to get the higher density of a maximum of 14.5 per acre, excluding senior housing. Those incentives would be defined in the design review standards and are for the undeveloped lands of multi-density units of today. 2nd by Angus 7 Yes, 1 No (Kesinger), 2 abstain (Kiehne-Lamkin & Salvatore) Motion Passed.

6.01.05 Motion by Roberson: We support mixed use including Main Street with no residential visible from Main Street and residential as secondary use. Anderson Second 8 Yes & 2 No (Kiehne-Lamkin & Kesinger) Motion Passed.

6.01.05 Motion by Wylie: On Commercial area we allow mixed use with commercial & residential with residential as a secondary use at 49% max. 2nd by Kiehne-Lamkin. Wylie: B & D not quite sure about where to end the area. 3rd to 14th Street and A, B, D & E Streets. (Motion revised to include these areas and revision was accepted by both maker and 2nd) 8 Yes, 1 No (Kesinger) 1 Abstain (Lewallen)

6.01.05 Motion by Angus: We do not extend the mixed use to the areas from 14th to Etchevery Street. Salvatore 2nd. 8 Yes, 1 No (Lewallen) 1 Abstain (Anderson)

6.01.05 Motion by Roberson: Create a base that is at 7.3 and build in incentives to get the higher density of a maximum of 14.5 per acre, excluding senior housing. Those incentives would be defined in the design review standards and are for the undeveloped lands of multi-density units of today. 2nd by Angus 7 Yes, 1 No (Kesinger), 2 abstain (Kiehne-Lamkin & Salvatore) Motion Passed.

6.15.05 Motion by Lewallen: This group support the concept of no median in Village Center with expanded parkway in Village Center. Encourage medians in the Gateway and Paseo areas and implement the mini bypass from 3rd to 10th streets with B Street going west and D Street going east one way. Salvatore 2nd 8 yes and 1 no (Kiehne-Lamkin)

7.06.05 Motion by Kesinger: The desirability of the Ramona Village design for residents and businesses depends on public amenities that are recommended by the RVDC. Therefore, these recommendations that would increase the residential densities, or expand commercial or industrial use should depend on the presence of a mechanism(s) to develop, maintain, and manage the amenities, including parks, streets, landscaping, and community buildings and facilities. 2nd Kiehne-Lamkin. Motion passed 7-1 Anderson no vote.

7.06.05 Motion by DeMund: The group supports limited parking between landscaped pockets to mimic the existing block of 7th to 8th street. 2nd by Kesinger 7 Yes - 1 No (Salvatore) Motion Passed.

7.06.05 Motion by DeMund: Support special densities or density incentives for senior housing only. Support relaxed building height (up to 45 feet) for senior housing facilities only, subject to further solid language guaranteeing permanent use for senior housing. 2nd Kesinger. Motion Passed 6-2 Kesinger and Kiehne-Lamkin opposing.

3.08.06 Motion by DeMund: Motion to recommend that the revisions be adopted and this document be published, dispersed to all appropriate bodies for review and that the comments be attached as an addendum as it moves into phase 2. 2nd Salvatore.

Motion to call for the question: 10/0/0. Vote on the motion: 9/1/0 Kesinger opposed.

(Prior Discussion:

Kesinger: It is implied that all members support and approve this document by their names. He wants it noted that not this entire document was agreed upon this document.

Woods: we can publish the voting record. 90% of the voting record was unanimously voted on. We are to look at the whole project.)

3.08.06 Motion by Kesinger: Motion to add a notation of how each person voted on this document on the front page. 2nd Salvatore

Discussion: not in favor of it being on the front page. Maybe as an addendum at the back. Opposed due to it is in conflict of all other bodies.

Amend the motion that we create an addendum that states unanimous votes and clarifies the votes that were not unanimous. By Kesinger 2nd Salvatore 8/2/0 Anderson & DeMund opposed.